



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/534,916	03/23/2000	David J. Marsh	MS1-525US	9507

22801 7590 07/18/2002

LEE & HAYES PLLC  
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500  
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

LEE, SEUNG H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/534,916

Applicant(s)

MARSH, DAVID J.

Examiner

Seung H L e

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22, 24-46, 50 and 52-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22, 24-46, 50, 52-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 22 April 2002 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 9-12, 16, 18, 19, 21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Owashi et al. (US 6,363,210)(hereinafter referred to as 'Owashi').

Owashi teaches to checking whether an IC card (180) is authorized to encrypt (165) and decrypt (168) the media content received at a user's home from a programming source with one particular household such as receiver decoder (52) wherein the IC card stores a valuable data such as a user ID serves as a decryption key to confirm the signal reception permission and arithmetic algorithm serves as an additional data in which can be changeable, the user ID does not encrypt and decrypt the media content associated with other households such as VTR (53), a communication module or management circuit (164) to communicate to encryption circuit (165) and decryption circuit (68) to confirm the result of collating user identifying code with the user ID stored in the IC card, and encrypt and decrypt the media content only if the smart card is authorized to encrypt and decrypt the media content only if data (i.e., arithmetic algorithm) other than electronic money is stored on the smart card (see Figs. 6-7; col. 9, line 53- col. 12, line 44).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 13, 14, 26 -32, 34-45, 50, 52, 53, and 55-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owashi in view of Handelman et al. (US

5,666,412, on the record)(hereinafter referred to as 'Handelman') and Adams (US 6,378,130).

The teachings of Owashi have been discussed above.

Although, Owashi teaches the IC card containing the user ID to encrypt/decrypt the media content, he fails to teach or fairly suggest that the IC card comprises a nonvolatile memory and a user-specific information storage section.

However, Handelman teaches a memory unit comprises a nonvolatile memory or Read Only Memory (ROM) (see col. 12, line 22 - 31), the smart card is used to limit where rendering of the media content can occur (12, 112, and 212) (see col. 7, line 14 - 23), a plurality of IC card (28 and 30) for a different category of media content, the smart card corresponds to a particular category of media content that comprise a family oriented media which program does not require the parental control and adult oriented media which program requires the parental control (see col. 3, line 13 - 18), comparing a rating corresponding to the media content (parental control) to a rating associated with a smart card and allowing access to the media content if the rating corresponding to the media content does not exceed the rating associated with the smart card (see col. 7, line 24 - 43), the rating associated with the smart card is stored on the smart card (see col. 3, line 18 - 23), the allowing access comprising allowing the media content to be decrypted (Describable Program Channel) for rendering (see Fig. 2), requiring the smart card to be inserted into a smart card reader coupled to a computing device (50) that is decrypting the media content (see Fig. 7), the smart card having a processor to execute instruction to encrypt/decrypt the media content and to manage the user-specific

information storage section (see col. 8, line 9 - 38), maintaining user information on the smart card (28 and 30), the information being available only when the smart card is coupled to the computing device (10) (see Fig. 1), the network devices include to receive media content (10) and device to render media content (12) (see Fig. 1), one of plurality of smart card is coupled to a device (10) when the smart card is inserted into a smart card reader coupled to the device (10) (see Fig. 1). And Adams teaches the memory (32) of the set-top terminal (6) includes a parental control codes, favorite channel lineups, authorization table (see Fig. 3; col. 4, lines 43-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate teachings of Handelman and Adams to the teachings of Owashi in order to provide an improved and an enhanced means by encrypting and decrypting the media content based on the key value of the smart card (i.e., adult and/or family oriented media content). Moreover, such modification would provide a control of the decrypting of the media content means wherein the smart card can be programmed to properly decrypt the media content for specified time period (i.e., from 4:00 PM to 8:00 PM for children). Furthermore, such modification (e.g., storing the personnel favorite channels, parental codes, authorization table onto the smart card) would provide a convenient operating means by accessing the favorite channels stored in the memory through a multiple set-top boxes where the smart card can be acknowledged by terminal, and therefore an obvious expedient.

6. Claims 20, 25, 33, 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owashi as modified by Handelman, and further in view of Thompson et al (US 5,805,204, on the record)(hereinafter referred to as 'Thompson').

The teachings of Owashi/Handelman have been discussed above.

Although, Owashi/Handelman teaches the communication system to encrypt and decrypt the media, he fails to teach or fairly suggest that one or more memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor.

However, Thompson teaches the communication module or decoder unit (50) comprises one or more computer-readable memories (69 and 73) containing a computer program that is executable by a processor (71) (see Fig. 7; col. 6, line 21 - col. 7, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the notoriously old and well known a processor to execute the computer program stored in a computer memories as taught by Thompson to the teachings of Owashi/Handelman in order to provide program and execute the program to encrypt and decrypt the media content according to the collating result, and therefore an obvious expedient.

7. Claims 3, 4, 15, 17, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owashi as modified by Handelman, and further in view of Teicher (US 5,744,787, on the record).

The teachings of Owashi/Handelman have been discussed above.

Although, Owashi/Handelman teaches the smart card to encrypt and decrypt the media content, he fails to teach or fairly suggest the smart card include electronic money.

Teicher teaches the smart card includes the electronic wallet (310) to make transaction only if the electronic wallet has enough money in the smart card (455) (see Fig. 3 and Fig. 5)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the electronic wallet as taught by Teicher to the teachings of Owashi/Handelman due to the fact that the processing time for one to order programs from the remote pay-per-view provider by the subscriber would be substantially reduced by eliminating the process/step of authorization/verification and debiting the value on the smart card at the moment the subscriber initiates the transaction/order. Moreover, such modification (i.e., the electronic wallet within the smart card) would provide a universal smart card to use at the multiple location/terminal (i.e., Point Of Sales Terminal (POS), ATM, gas station) to purchase the products or services, and therefore an obvious expedient.

8. Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owashi as modified by Handelman and Adams, and further in view of Rouyrre et al (US 5,841,119)(hereinafter referred to as 'Rouyrre').

The teachings of Owashi/Handelman/Adams have been discussed above.



Although, Owashi/Handelman/Adams teaches the method of identifying boundaries of a network, they fail to teach the smart card can be moved to different device to alter the boundaries of the network.

However, Rouyrre teaches a smart card can be used for payment card for telephone and accessing the TV pay channel (see col. 1, lines 18-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Rouyrre to the teachings of Owashi/Handelman/Adams in order to provide convenient means by accessing the various network using a single smart card, that is, user need only one smart card to access the telephone network and cable television network. Moreover, such modification would simplify the maintenance since users only carry one smart card, they only need to recognize one password and PIN number to access the multiple network, and therefore an obvious expedient.

### ***Response to Amendment***

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22, 24-46, 50, 52-57 has been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In response to the applicant's argument that *".....encryption of data occurred at the user's premises"* (see page 6, line 4+) and *"....the imbedded key of Thompson does not disclose or suggest a decryption key and additional data...."* (see page 7, line 12+), the examiner respectfully provide Owashi reference wherein Owashi teaches the encryption of the media at the user's house and user ID and additional data such as a

computer program to execute an arithmetic algorithm is stored on the IC card as discussed in paragraph 3 above.

In response to the applicant's argument that "*Handelman does not disclose a plurality of levels of control...*" (see page 9, line 1+), the Handelman simply provide an evidence of using smart card incorporating with the rating system to decrypt the content based on the value stored on the smart card. Therefore, when interpreting the claimed limitations as broadly as is reasonably possible, the combination of the teachings of Handelman and the teachings of Owashi meets the claimed limitation as discussed in paragraph 5 above.

In response to the applicant's argument that "*Handelman does not disclose or suggest a smart card with a user-specific information storage section to store user preferences*" (see page 12, line 3+), the examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant wherein the smart card must have the storage section in order to store the various information for accessing the media content.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure;

Barlow et al [US 6,038,551] and Burger [US 6,219,439] disclose the IC card for accessing network,

Budow et al [US 5,661,517] and Iverson et al [US 5,82,664] disclose an encoding and decoding of media signals.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Seung H. Lee whose telephone number is (703) 308-5894. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM.


If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee, can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax-phone number for this group is (703) 308-5841 or (703) 308-7722.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [[michael.lee@uspto.gov](mailto:michael.lee@uspto.gov)].

*All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.*

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

  
Seung H. Lee  
Art Unit 2876  
July 15, 2002

  
MICHAEL G. LEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800